

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/725,309	SINGH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard G Hutson	1652	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Richard G Hutson. (3)_____.
- (2) Joe Grunkenmeyer. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 12 March 2003 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: all of record .

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



RICHARD HUTSON, PH.D
PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative faxed the examiner a draft copy of a set of claims amended to overcome the rejections of record and asked the examiner his opinion of these claims. The examiner communicated to applicant's representative that applicants amendment appeared to overcome the 112 second paragraph issues, and appeared to address at least some of the 112 first paragraph issues, although whether the 112 first paragraph rejection would be removed would require further analysis. The examiner also initially did not feel that applicants amendment would overcome the 102/103 rejections of record, although the examiner would have to look more closely at these rejections. The examiner also expressed some concern as to whether the proposed amendments, "non-covalently" and "wherein the bound enzyme is catalytically active" would be entered after-final. The examiner suggested that applicant's representative file an after-final amendment to obtain a more thorough analysis of the proposed amendment, although the examiner could not promise that such an amendment would be entered..